(b) whether the people of Kurumbilavu and adjoining places had represented to the Government that they were being affected by the floods in the Karuvannur river and that the existence of bunds oneither side of the river was the reason for such places being affected by floods;

(c) whether the representations such as in (b) had been made even before this new canal from Muriyad lake was opened;

(d) whether the opening of the new canal has the effect of bringing to Kurumbilavu along with the river water a much larger volume of water in a specified time than was being carried by the river alone?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—(a) Yes; but only the low-lying portions.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes.

(d) The widening of the Chirakkal thodu caused a large additional draw-off from the river to deal with the extra quantity of water which would be brought down by the new Muriyad canal. The net result is that there would be no rise in the level of water in the places referred to.

Muriyad lake—water retained in during floods.

402. Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) the volume of water held back or retained by the Muriyad lake when the Karuvannur river is in floods, say with 14' water in the river, before the new canal was opened;

(b) the average volume of water released per hour from the Muriyad lake through the new canal when the river is in floods as in (a)?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—(a) The area of water spread of the Muriyad lake when the river is at 14' at the bridge gauge is about 8·5 square miles. The average depth of water in the lake will then be about 10'.

(b) About 2,000 cubic feet per second.

Bunds—Karuvannur river—effect of.

403. Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—Is the Government aware that measures taken by the Government to protect the areas in the higher regions adjoining the Karuvannur river have had the effect of ruining the areas lower down?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—Government will investigate and furnish the necessary information.

The Kodankulangara canal.

404. Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(a) whether the inhabitants of Eroor, Nadama and Irumpanam desoms have complained of the great damage done to their paddy lands by annual floods and whether they have proposed the opening of a canal between Vettuveli and Karingochira as a remedial measure;

(b) whether the Government has caused any investigation to be made regarding the aforesaid proposal, and if so; with what result;

(c) whether Government has not received an alternative scheme to remedy the injury by floods in the said area;

(d) whether the Government has considered the respective merits of the said proposals and come to any decision;

(e) whether Government proposes to take any action next year, in the said locality to prevent damage by floods in future?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—(a) Yes.

(b) The P. W. D. is investigating the matter.

(c) Yes.

(d) The questions are being considered. An investigation has been ordered.

(e) This will receive due consideration by Government after the investigation is over.

Kara-Kottaparamba road—proposal for.

405. Mr. K. M. Ibrahim.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) the date when the file of the Kara-Kottaparamba road was begun by the Edavilangu Panchayat with a copy of their representations on the table;

(b) whether (a) does not date as far back as 1097;

(c) how many times their request was repeated subsequently with the respective dates;

(d) whether the Government have during this long period of about 11 years ever opened the subject with the Taluk Board or District Board regarding the latter's small portion of one or two furlongs which was advanced by the Government as the difficulty in the matter on 17th February 1933 (page 1038) and if they have not, the reasons for it?

Mr. P. V. Raphael.—(a) 7th Kumbham 1097. A copy of the resolution is appended. (*Appendix V.*)

(b) Yes.

(c) The request was repeated on 21st Kanni 1098, 6th Kanni 1099, 4th Dhanu 1101, 30th Makaram 1102, 30th Thulam 1104 and 30th Kumbham 1108.

(d) No. Because the work would cost a large sum, viz., Rs. 18,500 and there was no proposal of its being taken up in the near future on account of limited finance of Cranganur.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly